WILLOUGHBY & HOEFER, P.A.

ATTORNEYS & COUNSELORS AT LAW
930 RICHLAND STREET
P.O. BOX 8416
COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA 29202-8416

MITCHELL M. WILLOUGHBY JOHN M.S. HOEFER ELIZABETH ZECK* RANDOLPH R. LOWELL K. CHAD BURGESS NOAH M. HICKS II** M. MCMULLEN TAYLOR BENJAMIN P. MUSTIAN

August 25, 2006

AREA CODE 803 TELEPHONE 252-3300 TELECOPIER 256-8062

*ALSO ADMITTED IN TX
**ALSO ADMITTED IN VA

The Honorable Charles L.A. Terreni Chief Clerk/Administrator **Public Service Commission of South Carolina** 101 Executive Center Drive Columbia, South Carolina 29210

RE: Application of United Utility Companies, Inc. for adjustment of rates and charges and modifications to certain terms and conditions for the provision of water and sewer service; 2006-107-W/S

Dear Mr. Terreni,

As you are aware, on August 23, 2006, United Utility Companies, Inc. ("UUC") and the South Carolina Office of Regulatory Staff ("ORS") filed an Explanatory Brief and a Joint Motion to establish a settlement hearing in the above-captioned proceeding and to approve the settlement agreement executed by UUC and ORS included therein as Attachment "A" ("Settlement Agreement"). At the time of the filing, the other parties of record in this proceeding, North Greenville University ("NGU") and Greenville Timberline SC, LLC ("GTSC"), had not yet conveyed their approval.

Thereafter, on August 24, 2006, NGU filed a letter with the Commission stating that it agreed with the terms and conditions set forth in the Settlement Agreement. By way of an email to Dr. David Butler, GTSC's attorney of record in this proceeding, Mr. George Lyall, informed the Commission that GTSC also consented to the agreement.

Given these recent communications, UUC believes it is appropriate to amend the Settlement Testimony of Converse A. Chellis, III, included as Exhibit "E" to the Settlement Agreement, in order to properly reflect that all parties of record have agreed to settle this matter. Additionally, UUC would take this opportunity to correct improper headings of the "Settlement Testimony" filed by Mr. Chellis and Dr. B.R. Skelton, included as Exhibit "F" to the Settlement Agreement. In each Exhibit, the witnesses' testimonies were inadvertently referred to as "Rebuttal Testimony." ORS has reviewed the proposed revisions and I am informed they have consented to amending said exhibits.

Enclosed, please find revised versions of both Exhibits "E" and "F." UUC would request that the Commission substitute these revised exhibits for Exhibits "E" and "F" originally filed with the Settlement Agreement. Thank you for your assistance with this matter. If you have any questions, or if I can be of any assistance, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely

WILLOUGHBY & HOEFER, P.A.

Benjamin P. Mustian

Enclosure

Shannon B. Hudson, Esquire cc: Nanette S. Edwards, Esquire Duke K. McCall, Jr., Esquire Jacqueline H. Patterson, Esquire

George K. Lyall, Esquire

BEFORE

THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF

SOUTH CAROLINA

DOCKET NO. 2006-107-W/S

IN R	E:)
Inc. f	ication of United Utility Companies, For adjustment of rates and charges modifications to certain terms conditions for the provision of r and sewer service. SETTLEMENT TESTIMONY CONVERSE CHELLIS
Q.	PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME, OCCUPATION AND BUSINESS ADDRESS.
A.	My name is Converse A. Chellis, III. I am a Certified Public Accountant
	("CPA") and a principal in and the Director of Litigation Services and Property Tax
	Services for Gamble Givens & Moody, LLC, a public accounting firm with offices in
	Charleston, Kiawah Island, and Summerville, South Carolina. My office is located at
	133 East First North Street, Suite 9, Summerville, South Carolina 29483.
Q.	PLEASE DESCRIBE YOUR EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND.
A.	In 1965, I graduated from The Citadel, The Military College of South Carolina
	with a bachelor's degree in business administration. I also have completed graduate level
	courses in accounting at the University of Georgia. In addition, I have had a minimum of
	forty (40) hours of continuing professional education ("CPE") each year since 1969, for a
	total of at least 1,440 total CPE hours.
Q.	PLEASE DESCRIBE YOUR WORK HISTORY AND PROFESSIONAL

EXPERIENCE PRIOR TO YOUR CURRENT POSITION.

Upon graduation from The Citadel in 1966, I served in the United States Air Force and was assigned to the Auditor General's staff. In 1969, I joined Touche Ross (now Deloitte and Touche) and was a senior accountant. I formed Chellis and Chellis in 1972, and have been a name partner and managing partner in several accounting firms until 1998. In 1999, I merged my firm with Gamble Givens & Moody, where I am a principal and Director of Litigation Services.

ARE YOU A MEMBER OF ANY PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATIONS?

Q.

A.

A.

Yes. I am a member of the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants ("AICPA"). From 1983-1985, I served on AICPA's continuing education executive committee, and in 1985 I served on the AICPA council.

I am also a member of the South Carolina Association of Certified Public Accountants ("SCACPA"). I served as Vice-President of the SCACPA's Coastal Chapter in 1977-78 and as President in 1978-79. In 1985 I served as the State President of the SCACPA, having previously served on the state level as Vice-President, Secretary/Treasurer, and Director. I have also been Chairman of the SCACPA's Committee on Continuing Professional Education, Chairman and trustee for the SCACPA's educational fund, and Chairman of the SCACPA's Committee on Cooperation with Governmental Agencies.

From 1986-1994, I was a member of the State Board of Accountancy, where I served as Secretary/Treasurer from 1988-1990 and Chairman from 1990-1993.

From 1982-1998, I was a member of Accounting Firms Associates, inc. I am also a past member of the American Society of Appraisers, and a current member of the

American College of Forensic Examiners. In addition, I am a past associate in the Municipal Finance Officers Association, and I have held various offices in the National Association of Accountants. I am also active in the peer review process, which involves examination of the work of other accountants and accounting firms to assure that quality controls are being applied in conformance with the Quality Control Standards adopted by the AICPA.

7 Q. HAVE YOU EVER GIVEN ANY PRESENTATIONS TO OTHER 8 ACCOUNTANTS OR AUDITORS?

9 A. Yes. I have been a speaker and an instructor for the accounting profession on a

10 number of accounting topics, including topics related to generally accepted accounting

11 principles ("GAAP").

12 Q. HAVE YOU EVER BEEN QUALIFIED AS AN EXPERT WITNESS IN A SOUTH 13 CAROLINA COURT?

14 A. Yes. I have been qualified as an expert witness in both the circuit and family
15 courts of South Carolina. I have also given testimony before this Commission and other
16 administrative agencies.

17 Q. WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR SETTLEMENT TESTIMONY?

18

19

20

21

A. The purpose of my settlement testimony is to support the adoption of the Settlement Agreement reached between United Utility Companies, Inc., or "UUC", the South Carolina Office of Regulatory Staff, or "ORS", and the other parties of record in this case.

1 Q. IN YOUR OPINION, IS THE SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT A REASONABLE 2 MEANS OF RESOLVING THE ISSUES IN THIS CASE?

3 A. Yes, it is.

A.

4 Q. WHAT IS THE BASIS FOR YOUR OPINION IN THIS REGARD?

I have several reasons for believing that the Settlement Agreement is a reasonable means by which to resolve the disputed issues in this case. First, one of the statutory duties of ORS is to facilitate the resolution of disputed issues involving matters within the jurisdiction of the Commission. I think it incumbent upon the other parties in cases before the Commission to work with ORS in good faith in an attempt to reach a settlement. I believe that the Settlement Agreement reflects a good faith effort on the parties of record in this proceeding to meet their respective obligations in that regard.

Second, and as Dr. Skelton mentions in his testimony in support of the Settlement Agreement, capital markets recognize the value of settlements in ratemaking cases. Additional investment resulting from favorable capital markets would be an enhancement to economic development in South Carolina which is consistent with the public interest.

Third, a settlement brings the matter to an end without delay and the uncertainty of further proceedings; this in turn permits ORS to focus its talents and resources on other matters within its area of responsibility and permits the Company to focus upon the continued improvement and expansion of its facilities and services for the benefit of its customers.

1		In summary, the comprehensive settlement proposed by the parties in my opinion
2		fairly balances the interest of the customers and the Company. I therefore respectfully
3		urge that the Commission approve the Settlement Agreement.
4		
5	Q.	DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR SETTLEMENT TESTIMONY?
6	A.	Yes it does.
7		

BEFORE

THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF

SOUTH CAROLINA

DOCKET NO. 2006-107-W/S

IN R	E:)
Inc. and and o	ication of United Utility Companies, for adjustment of rates and charges modifications to certain terms conditions for the provision of r and sewer service. SETTLEMENT TESTIMONY OF B.R. SKELTON PhD.
Q.	PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME, BUSINESS ADDRESS AND OCCUPATION.
A.	My name is B. R. Skelton and my business address is 2962 Walhalla Highway,
	Six Mile, South Carolina 29682. I am Professor Emeritus of Economics at Clemson
	University and am engaged in a variety of private business endeavors, including real
	estate brokerage and residential construction. I also act as a mediator and arbitrator.
	Since 1974, I have mediated 190+ disputes and written decisions in over 1000 arbitration
	cases, mostly union-management grievances. I have also arbitrated deferrals from the
	courts and the NLRB.
Q.	PLEASE DESCRIBE YOUR EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND AND
	PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE.
A.	I received my B.S. degree in Arts & Sciences (History & Economics) from
	Clemson University in 1956. In 1958, I received a Masters of Science degree in
	Agricultural Economics from Clemson University. I received my Ph.D. in Economics

from Duke University in 1964.

From 1959 to 1987, I was a professor of Economics at Clemson except for 1961-63 when I was in graduate school at Duke University. In addition to teaching standard economic theory, my academic background includes writing, lecturing and research in the areas of labor economics, economic development and arbitration. While at Clemson, I was a member of the Southern Economics Association and American Economic Association. I was also a member of the Arbitration Panel of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service and the American Arbitration Association. I retired from Clemson in 1987.

Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE YOUR WORK IN THE REAL ESTATE FIELD.

Over time I have developed subdivisions, commercial property, apartments and bought and sold real estate of all types.

12 Q. DO YOU PROVIDE ANY CONSULTING SERVICES?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

18

22

Q.

I have served as a consultant to various individuals and companies, mostly wrongful death and injury, divorce, product liability and valuation of business losses. I was President of Economic Research and Consulting Associates prior to 1980, the business that provided this analysis. I have testified before the PSC in one case involving a water company in Oconee County.

Q. DO YOU HOLD ANY OTHER PROFESSIONAL DESIGNATIONS?

Yes. I am a mediator and arbitrator and am licensed by the State of South
Carolina as both a real estate broker and residential contractor. I am also an elected
member of the National Academy of Arbitrators and have been a member since 1981.

WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR SETTLEMENT TESTIMONY?

A. The purpose of my testimony is to provide support for the Settlement Agreement entered into by the parties in the proceeding on August 23, 2006. Specifically, I will be testifying as to the reasons why the 9.40% Return on Equity ("ROE") agreed to by the parties is a reasonable ROE for the Company in the context of a comprehensive settlement of this specific case and why the Commission should approve the proposed settlement.

Q.

A.

Q.

Α.

WHY, IN YOUR OPINION, IS THE SETTLEMENT ROE OF 9.40% SUPPORTABLE AS A REASONABLE ROE FOR THE COMPANY IN THE CONTEXT OF A COMPREHENSIVE SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT?

In the context of the present settlement agreement, which disposes of all issues in the case, rates set based upon a 9.40% ROE can provide investors the opportunity to earn a reasonable return on the Company's capital investment. Based on my knowledge of the capital market, and my understanding of its expectations related to regulated and non-regulated returns in the present economic context, I believe that 9.40% is a sufficient return which the capital market would expect in the context of a comprehensive settlement.

WHY IS A SETTLEMENT IMPORTANT TO CAPITAL MARKETS?

I believe that investors place great importance on the settlement of litigation disputes involving any industry. I am aware from my experience in mediating and arbitrating labor disputes that the capital markets in general react favorably to the settlement of wage/benefit issues which comprise only one aspect of the overall financial picture for non-regulated industries. Whether utility rate cases are settled or litigated is

even more important to investors in the utility industry as these cases involve every aspect of the financial picture of a utility and therefore figure prominently in analysts' reports and evaluations of these cases. The settlement of a rate case is therefore a factor that strongly influences the capital market's assessment of the regulatory climate a utility operates in. The capital market sees settlements as an indication of a cooperative relationship between a utility and its regulators and the other participants in the regulatory process. Given this, I believe that this settlement should be approved.

9 COMMISSION SHOULD APPROVE THE SETTLEMENT PROPOSED BY THE 10 PARTIES IN THIS CASE?

A. Yes. I believe that administrative economy supports Commission approval of the proposed settlement and that settlements should be favored since they reflect a solution devised by the parties which is more likely to address their needs.

WOULD YOU ELABORATE ON THAT STATEMENT?

Q.

A.

Yes. The Commission has scarce resources available to be used in the discharge of its duties. These are important duties which have been delegated to the Commission by the legislature. Settlement of this case will permit the Commission to focus its resources on other matters within its purview. Further, in my experience as a mediator and arbitrator, I have come to understand that part of the value of settling disputed matters is that it results in a resolution more likely to fit the needs and circumstances of the parties than does an imposed resolution. I believe that to be the case here.

Q. DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR TESTIMONY?

1 A. Yes, it does.